

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application in view of the present amendments and remarks is respectfully requested. All rejections and objections are respectfully traversed.

Rejections Under §112

The specification and the claims stand rejected under §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for not describing a “processing unit” or any other type of “unit.”

Applicant has amended the claims to remove each recitation of “unit” and replaced it with the recitation of “means” as was present in the claims prior to the last amendment. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection, with respect to the use of the term “unit,” has now been rendered moot and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In the Claims

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7 and 19 to recite, among other limitations:

a memory;
processor means for intercepting documents from, and having a connection to, a first network;
said processor means storing information relating to said documents in said memory

Applicant respectfully submits that support for these amendments to the claims is found at least at page 9, lines 23 - 38, with reference to “buffer memory 120, 121;” page 21, lines 8-16; and Figs. 4 and 6.

Applicant submits that the reference to “a memory” is a structural limitation but acknowledges that other “means-plus-function” limitations of the claims may be interpreted as software *per se*.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that each claim must be interpreted as a whole and the recitation of the memory structure removes the claim from being interpreted as only software. (See Supplementary Examination Guidelines for Determining Compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112 and for Treatment of Related Issues in Patent Applications, Federal Register, Sec. C.(3), Vol. 76, No. 27, page 7168, February 9, 2011. “It is important to remember that claims must be interpreted as a whole so, a

Application No. 10/580,765
Filed: May 26, 2006
Art Unit: 2431
Confirmation No.: 8329

claim that includes a means-plus-function limitation that corresponds to software *per se* [and is thus indefinite for lacking structural support in the specification] is not necessarily directed as a whole to software *per se* unless the claim lacks other structural limitations.”)

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes the pending claims are in condition for allowance and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application. The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due to this submission, or credit any balance, to Deposit Account No. 23-0804.

Respectfully submitted,
Hassane ESSAFI

Dated: 2011-06-09
By:/Charles L. Gagnebin iii/
Charles L. Gagnebin, III
Reg. No. 25,467

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,
GAGNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP
Ten Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109
Tel: 617.542.2290
Fax: 617.451.0313

403017.1